

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

# THE ORDER OF THE LUKAN 'INTERPOLATIONS'

## II The Smaller Interpolation, Lk. 6:20-8:3

B. W. Bacon
Yale University

It has been already noted[1] that Mt. and Lk. agree in introducing, at the first convenient opportunity afforded by their adoption of Mk.'s outline, not the Sermon on the Mount alone, as a résumé of the preaching of Jesus to the multitude, but the Sermon *plus* a narrative sequel. Moreover, the bridge is formed in each by a colophon of coincident form (and therefore, probably derived from the Second Source[2]) which marked the transition from discourse to narrative.[3]

In this narrative section the Believing Centurion (Q) occupied a place, but, as its reference to the unbelief of Israel implies, its position in S was nearer the close than the beginning. For we have no right to assume that Lk. has omitted none of the narratives of S. On the contrary the colloquy with the centurion implies not only an acquaintance on the centurion's part with Jesus' ministry of healing, but also a disappointment on Jesus' part with the results of his gospel among his own people; for in the story the believing Gentile is used as a foil to the many unbelieving Jews of whom the reader is already supposed to know. In this brief narrative section (Lk. 7:1-8:3), we thus already encounter numerous indications of a disturbance of the original order. Can any common principle be discovered which will account for the present arrangement?

In a general way Lk., arriving with 6:11 at the point where Mk. 3:6 relates the culmination of the opposition in plots against Jesus' life, shows himself conscious of a certain lack

[1] See Art. I *JBL.*, xxxiv. (1915), 166-179. In the series the articles will be referred to by numbers only as I, II, III.

[2] In distinction from Q (double-tradition material) the Second Source will be designated S. R will be used for editorial material, with suspended "Mt.," "Mk.," "Lk.," to indicate the special redactor.

[3] I, p. 168.

in Mk., his principal source. Doubtless he misses in Mk. 3:7-4:25 an account of Jesus' teaching of his own disciples; for the parables which in Mk. 4:1-34 are supposed to convey "the mystery of the kingdom" are not treated in Lk. as really adequate for the purpose. In Lk. the Markan parables of the kingdom are distributed on various occasions, or else omitted. Whether the existence of the Sermon in 𝔖 suggested the need of supplementing Mk. at this point, or Lk. felt the deficiency independently, is immaterial. The great additions made by both Mt. and Lk. of teaching material at about the same point in Mk.'s narrative is evidence enough of their sense of its inadequacy in this respect.

But it is important to recognize that the disturbance created by Lk.'s large insertion of 𝔔 material in 6:20 ff. is not strictly limited to the supplement itself; but *extends to the adjoining Markan material.*

It would be too much to expect that a raconteur of Lk.'s skill should oblige the critics by making the divisions of his subject coincide exactly with the sutures of his documentary excerpts; We must search for the idea and predominant motive of his supplementation *in the alterations made in the Mk. context before and after.*

The readjustments of Mk.'s order by Lk. before and after his Smaller Interpolation are slight but significant.

1. In Mk. 3:7-35 the interval between the Opposition to Jesus' Ministry which culminated in Plots against his Life (Mk. 2:1-3:6) and the Teaching in Parables (4:1-33) is occupied by three paragraphs explanatory of Jesus' special relation to the inner circle to whom he delivered "the mystery of the Kingdom of God" (4:10 f.).

*a.* An editorial survey (ver. 7-12) describes the flocking of the multitude to the seaside plain and introduces (ver. 13-19) the Choosing of the Twelve.

*b.* The saying on Spiritual Kin (ver. 35) is framed in a narrative setting ($19^b$-21, 31-34) which is further expanded by the insertion of

*c.* The 𝔔 incident of the Blasphemy of the Scribes (22-30).

Both Mt. and Lk. deal freely with this connective tissue of

Mk., omitting entirely the framework of *b*, displacing and scattering the editorial elements of *a*, and removing *c* to its proper (Q) context.

The result of these changes is (for the τάξις of Lk. at least) a very manifest improvement, whether due solely to the evangelist's own reflection, or (more probably) to the better order exhibited by the source-elements of Mk.'s agglomeration (List of the Twelve, Blasphemy of the Scribes, *logion* on Spiritual Kin) in their primary connection. The improvement of order in Lk. will be apparent from the following:

1. The Choice of the Twelve (Lk. 12:6-16) comes now to follow immediately the Opposition of the Scribes (Mk. 3:1-6 = Lk. 6:6-11), thus avoiding the hysteron-proteron of Mk. 3:7, μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. By the same simple transfer Lk. also avoids the extreme awkwardness of Mk.'s connection as respects time and place. Thus Mk. had

(*a*) Gathering of the πολὺ πλῆθος at the seaside (3:7-12).

(*b*) Departure of Jesus and a selected company εἰς τὸ ὄρος (13-19[a]).

(*c*) Return εἰς οἶκον, *second* ὄχλος, intervention of kindred (19[b]-21, 31-35).

[(*d*) Disconnected episode of the Blasphemy of Scribes (22-30)].

(*e*) *Third* appearance of the ὄχλος πλεῖστος at the seaside (4:1).

Mt.'s remedy for this is to make the multitude follow Jesus and the select company from the seaside plain εἰς τὸ ὄρος (Mt. 4:24-5:1). Lk.'s is simpler. By placing the Choice of the Twelve slightly earlier Jesus can come down with them from the mountain (6:17[a]) and preach to the assembled multitude on the seaside plain. To explain how the multitude comes to be assembled there Lk. has only to slightly modify Mk. 3:7-12, setting forth that they had come from the regions specified "to hear him" and to be healed (6:17[b]-19).

2. Equal improvement on Mk.'s τάξις is obtained by deferring the omitted source elements of Mk. 3:7-35.

The cancellation by both Mt. and Lk. of Mk.'s unfavorable representation of Jesus' Mother and Brethren (Mk. 3:19[b]-21) was of course to be expected. Also the return to its (Q) context

(Lk. 11:14 ff.) of the digressive episode of the Blasphemy of the Scribes (Mk. 3:22-30). This left unutilized of Mk.'s connective tissue only the *logion* on Spiritual Kin, whereof a not easily recognizable doublet appears in Lk. 11:27 f., connected *as in Mk.* with the Blasphemy of the Scribes.[4] The improvement (from Lk.'s point of view) resulting from the transfer of this to a point following, instead of preceding, the revelation of "the mystery of the kingdom" is very marked. Deferred to Lk. 8:19-21 the intervention of Jesus' Mother and Brethren assumes the very opposite of the unfavorable aspect it bears in Mk.[5] In the Lukan context they appear after the Parable of the Sower, or (as we should more properly designate it) of Fruitful and Unfruitful Sowing, as examples of those who "hear the word of God and do it." The ensuing context (6:22-9:50) resumes the narrative of Mk. 4:34-9:40, leaving the *logion* on Spiritual Kin, together with the Parable of Fruitful and Unfruitful Sowing and connected *logia* on "hearing the word of God" (8:4-18), to close the entire section devoted to the Teaching of Disciples. In short $\mathfrak{R}^{Lk.}$ closes the Interpolation which began with the Sermon, with this Markan incident, because *as thus placed* Jesus' mother and brethren became the best examples of those who receive the word into good and fruitful soil.

Lk.'s transposition of Mk. 3:20 f., 31-35, accordingly, is not a mere matter of improving the sequence of the narrative. Alterations of Markan order are very rare in Lk., and always have cogent occasion. In the present instance the changes of phraseology, which accompany the transposition and so decidedly alter the meaning, confirm the impression of editorial readjustment. They furnish indeed the key to the evangelist's motive in constructing the whole section with which we are dealing.

As we now see by the changes effected in the Markan context before and after the supplement[6] this section must be widened to include Lk. 6:12-8:21. The saying "My mother and breth-

[4] This connection, purely pragmatic in character, is one of many indications that the points of contact between Mk. and $\mathfrak{Q}$ are due to editorial supplementation of Mk. from $\mathfrak{S}$.

[5] On the effort of later evangelists to mitigate the unfavorable reflections of Mk. on the twelve and Jesus' Kindred see Nicolardot, *Procedés de Rédaction,* 1908, p. 127.

[6] Cf. especially Lk. 8:22 with Mt. 4:35.

ren are they that *hear the word of God and do it''* is the goal to which everything from the beginning of the supplement is leading up. Recognize this, and immediately the editorial treatment receives its explanation, both as respects alteration of phraseology and as respects the selection and order of material. The editor has the practical aim of commending those who ''hear and do the word'' (cf. 6:27, 47; 8:4-21). He therefore describes not only the teaching of Jesus, but *the reception which it met from the Elect.*

This interest in the elect is no new thing with Lk. At the beginning of the Sermon the Beatitudes pronounced upon ''the disciples'' were emphasized by an antithesis of four Woes denounced upon the self-satisfied, while the contrast of the source between the ethic of former times and that of the children of God (''they of old time said . . . But I say'') is changed to a contrast between those who hear the word of God and those who turn a deaf ear to the message. ''Woe unto you that are rich . . . But unto *you that hear* I say'' is Lk.'s antithesis. He is already contrasting the two classes encountered by the Teacher, the elect and the non-elect (cf. Acts 13:48). In the Book of Acts it will become still more apparent how he aims to carry back the origins of the Christian brotherhood to the earliest and highest sources, just as in the Gospel he carries the story of John and Jesus back to an infancy among the meek and devout, the lowly saints who could be regarded as the real heirs of the promises.

We may now turn from the Markan *framework* of the Interpolation to the Interpolation itself, designating by A its teaching element (6:20-49), and by B its narrative (7:1-8:3).

The Sermon (A) ends with a parable which may well have suggested to Lk. the theme of this entire section: ''Everyone that cometh unto me and *heareth my words and doeth them* I will show you to whom he is like'' (6:46 ff.). This parable seems to be viewed by Lk. as the counterpart of the Markan parable of Fruitful and Unfruitful Sowing with which the section ends (8:4-18). Nor is this an inappropriate use of the material. Note that this parable is the only one of Mk.'s series of Parables of the Kingdom which Lk. here adopts, and that he interjects repeatedly references to *''hearing the word and doing it.''* As in Mk., so here, at the close of the parable (8:8) Jesus

cries "'He that hath ears to *hear* let him *hear.*'" The interpretation explains (v. 11) that, "the seed is *the word of God*" while the three classes who "hear and do not" are specified in verses 12, 13 and 14, followed by ver. 15 which illustrates "such as having *heard the word* . . . bring forth fruit with persistence." Finally the Markan sequence breaks off with ver. 18 (= Mk. 4:24 f.) "Take heed, therefore, *how ye hear;* for whosoever hath, to him shall be given" etc.

This iteration and reiteration of warnings on "hearing the word of God and doing it," especially when we note how Lk. has abbreviated and changed the text of Mk., and how he varies from the Q text of Mt., should suffice to define for us the pragmatic interest which controls him in the beginning and ending of the section appended to Mk.'s account of the Effects of Jesus' Teaching (Mk. 1:40-3:12, 13-19 = Lk. 5:12-6:11, 17-19, 12-16), the section of the Smaller Interpolation.

Unlike Mk., Lk. is here not so much bent on accounting for the disobedience of Israel as on exhibiting the obedience of the lowly remnant. At the close, Jesus' mother and brethren are examples of the obedient, but the preceding Markan parable, and especially the selection from the appended Markan sayings, show that Lk. has also in mind the Markan contrast of obedient and disobedient. Herein lies the key to the subdivision of the section, which as we have already shown extends from 6:12 to 8:21, the Markan material at beginning and end (6:12-19 = Mk. 3:13-19[a], 7-10, and 8:4-21 = Mk. 4:1-25; 3:31-35) serving as a mere framework for the non-Markan material.

The Teaching section (A) and the Narrative section (B) of the non-Markan material seem to represent respectively to R Lk. the Sowing of "the word of God," and its effect upon two classes of hearers, believing and unbelieving, obedient and disobedient. Our attention will be first directed to the latter.

The following are the successive scenes of B:

(1) Believing Centurion (7:1-10);

(2) Miracle at Nain (11-17);

(3) Stumbling at John and Jesus by all save Wisdom's Children (18-35);

(4) Self-complacent Pharisee and Penitent Harlot (36-50);

(5) Ministering Women (8:1-3).

These are clearly so many illustrations in point to show how the penitent and lowly received the message, whereas Israel as a whole turned a deaf ear, some, like "the disciples of John," stumbling; others, like the Pharisees, holding self-righteously aloof. Lk.'s addition to Mk. here is similar in pragmatic interest to the addition of the Woes to the Beatitudes. It emphasizes the distinction of the two classes among the Jewish hearers of Jesus. Not all were disobedient, as the hasty reader might infer from Mk. The rich and self-complacent rejected Jesus, but the lowly received the word of God. To make this application clearer the evangelist in 7:29 f. appends to his story of Jesus' reply to "the messengers of John" an adaptation of the Q saying which Mt. more correctly reports in connection with Jesus' reply to the messengers of the Sanhedrin (Mt. 21:31 f.):

> Now all the people when they heard, and the publicans, justified God, having been baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, not having been baptized of him.

The editorial recasting of the comment is quite apparent from the phraseology (*cf.* "justified God." ver. 39, with "Wisdom is justified of her children," ver. 35; "rejected the counsel of God," ver. 30, with Acts 2:23), and the reference to "the baptism of John" (*cf.* Mt. 21:25); but the fact of the transfer and adaptation makes the editor's pragmatic interest doubly certain. *He constructs the group of anecdotes in* 7:1-8:3 (B) *for the purpose of contrasting obedient and disobedient "hearers of the word."*

With this key to the pragmatic purpose of R Lk. in our hands it is impossible any longer to imagine that he should be greatly concerned to retain the chronological order of source, or sources, supposing such an order to have once existed. The parable likening "everyone that cometh unto me and heareth my words and doeth them" to the man who built his house upon the rock, wherewith the Sermon (A) closes, has for our evangelist the same value and application as the Markan parable of Fruitful and Unfruitful Sowing, wherewith he ends the section. Between the two he inserts the series of anecdotes that mark the desired application. All are derived from other sources than Mk. All *might* be from S. But *if* from S they cannot be assumed

to stand in their original order; for the present order is too characteristically Lukan. To make this clear we must once more survey the τάξις of B, seeking a motive for the present sequence.

(*a*) The Believing Gentile heads the series (7:1-10) precisely as the same motive leads off in the Lukan story of the ministry as a whole, when Jesus, rejected by his fellow-townsmen in Nazareth, retorts with the reference to the sending of Elijah and Elisha to the Gentiles (4:16-29). The prefixing has the same motive in each case (the motive so conspicuous in Acts), and in each case involves a flagrant hysteron proteron.[7] But to this, 𝔎 Lk. is sublimely indifferent.

(*b*) The Raising of the Widow's Son at Nain (11-17) is generally (and doubtless correctly) understood to owe its present position to the more important 𝔔 section on the Message of the Disciples of John which follows it. Whencesoever derived, it is held to have been prefixed by 𝔎 Lk. to make good the reference of ver. 22 "the dead are raised up," the Markan instance (Jairus' Daughter) being reserved for its authentic connection in 8:49-56.

(*c*) The Message of the Disciples of John and associated Stumbling of all save Wisdom's Children (18-35) needs no justification for its location. It forms the very nucleus and heart of the series, if indeed it did not actually suggest its formation. The disciples of John were a conspicuous element among those who came to the Lord and heard his word but did not build upon the rock. We have already adverted to 𝔎 Lk.'s underscoring of the desired application by the transfer hither of ver. 29 f. ( = Mt. 21:31 f.). This transfer also served to facilitate the inclusion of the second element of the 𝔔 story, Jesus' Complaint of the Generation which Stumbled both at the Baptist and Himself. For this element was quite as germane to the pragmatic purpose of 𝔎 Lk. as the first, but the reader was not yet informed that "the Pharisees and lawyers" had "rejected the counsel of God."

[7] In 4:23 the miracles in Capernaum (4:31 ff.) are presupposed. In 7:3, 9, 22, 31-35 not only the mighty works are presupposed, but Israel's rejection of the gracious Messenger. The editor's insertion of ver. 21 before 22, and 29-30 before 31-35 only makes the anachronism more conspicuous to the critical eye.

(*d*) The Penitent Harlot forms the close of the series, and does so with striking rhetorical effect so far as the Lukan pragmatism is concerned. When the condensed summary of (*e*) the Women who Ministered is added in 8:1-3, the two form the best possible preface to Lk.'s new form of the Markan anecdote of Jesus' Mother and Brethren, introduced along with the Parable of Fruitful and Unfruitful Sowing and connected *logia,* but *after* it. If, however, we ask what is likely to have been the pre-Lukan order of *c* and *d,* it is hardly supposable that if both were drawn from 𝔖 (as is highly probable from their mutual affinity) the narrator should have presented *first* (ver. 34) the complaint against Jesus as "a friend of publicans and sinners" and *afterwards* (ver. 36 ff.) the account of his dealings which gave rise to it. The hysteron-proteron of the present order is as plain here as in the other cases.

To sum up, the grouping of Lk. 7:1-8:3 is almost regardless of chronological sequence. $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.'s}}$ purpose is pragmatic, determined by the framework 6:46-49, and 8:4-21.

No more favorable judgment can be rendered regarding $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.'s}}$ probable faithfulness to the contents of the source, or sources, employed in either A or B.

On this point (cancellation by $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.}}$ of source material) the treatment of Mk. (for $\mathfrak{R}^{\text{Lk.}}$ an *authoritative* source) affords no surer inference than in respect to order.

Let the elements of this non-Markan section not also embodied by Mt. be designated 𝔓 (*i. e.* peculium). We have nothing as yet to connect $\mathfrak{P}^{\text{Lk.}}$[8] with 𝔖; neither have we the right to consider the non-appearance in Lk. of elements which in Mt. form part of the context ($\mathfrak{P}^{\text{Mt.}}$) evidence against their authenticity at this point in 𝔖. On the contrary, we have already seen evidence of editorial condensation by Lk. in 7:29 f. (= Mt. 21:28-32), and have reason to suspect it further in 8:1-3 ($\mathfrak{P}^{\text{Lk.}}$). Of the larger context which pursues a connected theme in Mt. 11:2-30; 12:17-21, 38-45; 20:1-16; 21:28-32 Lk. might easily defer or even omit altogether what was unsuited to his immediate purpose. He would not be ready to include the Woes on the Unbelieving Cities of Galilee (Mt. 11:20-24 = Lk.

[8] Matthaean "single tradition" material is distinguished from Lukan by the suspended letters.

10:13-16) until he had related the Mission of the Twelve and the Seventy. For similar reasons he would naturally defer to the same connection Jesus' Thanksgiving for the Revelation given to Sons (Mt. 11:25-30 = Lk. 10:21 f.). All this is completely accounted for by the pragmatic purpose of the group.

As regards the probability of omissions from the Smaller Interpolation whether from A, its teaching section, the Sermon on the Higher Righteousness (Lk. 6:20-49), or from B, the narratives of 7:1-8:3, we must first of all take account of the able discussion of Sir John C. Hawkins in the work already cited.[9]

Considering that both Mt. and Lk. have omitted passages from the Second Source, Sir John ranks first in probability among such the omission by Lk. of the substance of Mt. 5:17-48, *i. e.* the Antitheses of the Higher Righteousness. He submits first the general *a priori* consideration that Lk. systematically omits "anti-Pharisaic material."[10] He also submits two specific reasons: (*a*) the phrase ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν (Lk. 6:27)[11] and (*b*) the saying on Divorce (Lk. 16:17 f.) apparently drawn from the Antitheses (*cf.* Mt. 5:31 f.). On these grounds Sir John

> would place Mt. 5:17-48 by itself as a section which we may regard as more likely to have formed part of Q[12] than any other which is found only in a single Gospel.[13]

This agrees with the opinion expressed by the present writer on the same section in a volume on *The Sermon on the Mount*.[14]

As set forth in both Mt. and Lk. the ethic of the Sermon is not absolute but relative. Present these precepts in the absolute form and they become irrational. Neither Nietzsche nor Tolstoy shows good exegesis in separating the so-called precept of non-resistance from its context. For when Jesus sets up as the standard "your Father" who "is kind even to the unthank-

[9] *Oxford Studies* "The Double Tradition of Mt. and Lk."

[10] *Cf.* Luke's omission of Mk. 7:1-23 and 10:1-12.

[11] With this inserted phrase compare the observations made above on the editorial motive of the section 7:1-8; 21.

[12] In the citation "Q" is used to designate the source.

[13] *Op. cit.* p. 133.

[14] Macmillan Co., 1902, pp. 37-40.

ful and the evil,'' this is but the culminating example out of a series intended to illustrate a single general principle. This principle cannot be better expressed than in Eph. 5:1: ''Be ye therefore imitators of God as beloved children and walk in love.'' *Imitation of God's goodness* is the supreme virtue, alone befitting ''sons.''[15] But neither Jesus nor the evangelist can have meant to represent God as absolutely non-resistant to evil. The Source teaches simply that the current tit-for-tat ethics, good for good, evil for evil, is *not enough.* The ''righteousness of God'' must exceed. It *goes beyond* the lex talionis. God not only resists evil, but (in Pauline phrase) ''*overcomes* it with good.'' This ''goodness'' is to be limited by only one consideration—its effectiveness. When it tends to encourage evil instead of overcoming it it ceases to be imitation of God. Long-suffering, non-resistance, are indeed to be carried to an extreme like that of the long-suffering Father. But when resistance is better adapted to overcoming evil than non-resistance the divine example should be followed in this respect also.

The point for the critic to observe is that by the testimony of both Mt. and Lk. to the original form of the Sermon the righteousness of God was presented by ☧ *in the comparative degree.* But the omissions of Lk. tend strongly to obscure this. In Mt. the relativity of the new commandment to the old is strongly emphasized. The Antitheses illustrate the contrast of the higher righteousness of ''sons'' with that of ''the scribes and Pharisees.'' In Lk. also the *affirmative* element of the new law remains; but this is only half the teaching, and instead of Mt.'s vigorous contrast ''They of old said . . . But I say,'' it is appended by Lk. under the new rubric ''But unto *you which hear* I say'' (6:27). Something remains, even in Lk., of the contrast between the divine ''goodness'' and human, tit for tat ''righteousness.'' But the omission of the illustrative Antitheses almost spoils the intended effect. Lk. is so intent on avoiding ''anti-Pharisaic'' material, and so eager to emphasize his own

[15] The conception is common to Stoic and Graeco-Jewish ethics of this period. *Cf.* Ps. Aristeas, 188, 192, etc., and see Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology,* 1909, p. 199. ''In its broad features holiness is but another word for *Imitatio Dei.*'' Schechter refers to *Num. R.* 9:4 and 17:6.

contrast of the obedient who "hear the word,"[16] that we may be quite sure Sir John Hawkins is right in regarding Mt. as here the better representative of Ⓢ.[17]

Justice to the Source requires, therefore, first of all restoration of the Antitheses, and second, that we cancel Lk.'s editorial adversative "But *to you which hear* I say," substituting something like the formula of the Matthean Antitheses: "They of old time said . . . But I say . . ." In short the *Gospel of the Naassenes* quoted by Hippolytus (V. 7) is quite justified in combining this passage of the Sermon with the anecdote in Mk. 10:17-22 of the Rich Young Man seeking the Way of Life; for in both the higher 'goodness' of God is set in contrast with written precepts as giving the Christian standard of ethics. The anecdote of the Rich Suppliant takes the place (doctrinally) in Mk. of the Sermon on the Mount, as we have seen. The Naassenes show their appreciation of the fact by giving the answer of Jesus in this form:

> Why callest thou me 'good'; there is but One who is good, my Father in heaven, who causeth his sun to rise upon the just and the unjust, and sendeth rain upon saints and sinners.[18]

Mk. was not ignorant of Ⓢ. In this same anecdote he borrows the phrase "Thou shalt have treasure in heaven." But Mk. is too much of a Paulinist to include a *nova lex* in his Gospel, and therefore puts the teaching in the form more congenial to him of the living example. Lk. too is not pro-Pharisaic. He does not exclude the Woes against them of Lk. 11:37-44. But Lk. is eager to show that the *consistent* Pharisee is almost a Christian (Acts 23:6-9; 24:14-21; 26:5-8, 27 f.). Pharisees are guilty of "hypocrisy" (Lk. 12:1). They are "lovers of

[16] In addition to the instances adduced in 7:1-8:21 see also Lk. 10:16 and 11:28.

[17] On the fundamental teaching of the sermon of imitation of the divine "goodness," see Bacon, "Thankworthy Goodness" in *Expositor*, VIII, 42 (June, 1914), 502-518, and S. Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, ch. XIII "The Law of Holiness and the Law of Goodness." Marcion gives his own conception of the contrast by declaring Jehovah the Jewish God of the O. T. to be the god of mere unrelieved justice, but God the Father of Jesus to be the God of "goodness."

[18] Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, p. 11, lines 20-24.

money'' (16:14). Their conduct does not agree with their principles. They have the form and not the spirit. But if they lived up to their professions they would be ''not far from the kingdom of God.'' Lk., then, may be admitted to exclude ''anti-Pharisaic material''; but only if by ''anti-Pharisaic'' we mean teachings opposed to the piety of the Old Testament. Now on their negative side the Antitheses of the Sermon come very close to *such* opposition. They can easily be distorted into semblance to the ''Antitheses'' of Marcion; and when we observe how Lk. has uniformly cancelled Mk.'s anti-legalistic utterances (Mk. 7:1-23; 10:1-12) it becomes quite credible that he should cancel the Antitheses.

Still more illuminating examples of Lk.'s caution in admitting material which might give aid and comfort to the antinomian enemy will be found in his attachment to the parable of the Great Supper (Lk. 14:15-24) of the severe sayings on ''casting out'' (v. 35) those who do not show persistence in well-doing (vv. 25-35). Similarly he attaches sayings on the Perpetuity of the Law and of the Marriage Obligation to the radical Q utterance Lk. 16:16 ( = Mt. 11:12).

We must not only correct Lk.'s cancellations from Mt.'s version of the Sermon (of course avoiding Mt.'s very copious and easily recognizable additions) but Lk.'s order as well. For (as is commonly recognized) in Lk. 6:27-38 verses 27-29[a] are transposed from after 29[b]-30, and verse 31, belongs after 42, where it would follow in Mt. save for the Matthean additions.[19]

Addition also has been resorted to in Lk.'s form of the Sermon, as well as cancellation and transposition, though to a far less extent than in Mt.'s.

Whether the affixing of the Woes (Q Lk.) to the Beatitudes is the work of R Lk. as compiler or composer would be difficult to determine. On the other hand we may properly repeat here the assertion made in a previous volume:

> The two *logia* Lk. 6:39-40 have certainly a fictitious connection. As the paragraph stands the sense must be ''Beware of assuming to guide when not yourself enlightened.'' . . . But it can hardly be admitted that Jesus should have applied to any disciple of his own, however overhasty to assume the functions of a teacher, the epithet of 'blind guide.''[20]

[19] See for proof Bacon: *The Sermon on the Mount,* Macmillan, 1902, p. 157.

[20] *Sermon on the Mount,* p. 158.

In fact the witness of Mt. 7:1-5 where Lk. 6:41 f. follows 6:38 without a break (much to the advantage of the sense) should suffice to prove that in Lk. verses 39 and 40 have been interjected editorially. The reason is doubtless the superficial resemblance of the two cases: the brother who with a beam in his own eye attempts to remove the splinter from his neighbor's Lk. 6:39 f., and the blind man guiding the blind (Lk. 6:41 f. = Mt. 7:3-5). Both *logia* are 𝔔 material (Lk. 6:39 = Mt. 15:14 and Lk. 6:40 = Mt. 24:10 f.); but little can be said for Lk.'s location. In both cases the Matthean setting is at least as good as Lk.'s, and is followed by the fourth evangelist (Lk. 6:39 = Jn. 9:40 f., Lk. 6:40 = Jn. 13:16; 15:20). But 𝔔 material is not likely to be *all* from 𝔖. As previously stated "The sayings have the appearance of *logia* attached from floating tradition."[21] In the case of mere detached sayings connected neither with one another nor their context the presumption against a third source dwindles to very slight importance. If this be a case of independent attachment by Mt. and Lk. of floating *logia,* we have in the latter an instance of the disruption of the order of 𝔖 by addition. If it should prove possible to establish the original context in 𝔖 (whether Mt. 10:24 f.; 15:14 or some other) we should have a case of transposition effected either by Lk. or by some earlier redactor (ℜ$^{S}$), with the idea of rebuking the tendency to be "many teachers" (Jas. 3:1).

Thus in A as well as B ℜ$^{Lk.}$ already gives evidences of omission, of addition, and of transposition, in the 𝔔 material. Whether in every case our own third evangelist (ℜ$^{Lk.}$) is personally responsible for the change, or merely adopts the work of some earlier redactor (ℜ$^{S}$) cannot yet be made out; but the question does not affect the present argument, which aims only to show that the present order of the 𝔔 material in Lk. has suffered extensive changes from the sequence of 𝔖. ℜ$^{Lk.}$ does *not* extend to the Second Source the extreme deference paid to Mk. This is certainly true as regards its order, and almost as certainly its contents, especially in narrative material.

Recognizing, as we must, the untrustworthiness of all inferences from the present order of Lk.'s Smaller Interpolation to the τάξις of 𝔖 may it not be possible to draw more reliable deductions from comparison with Mt. and Mk.?

[21] So *Sermon on Mt.,* p. 159; *cf.* Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus,* pp. 28, 81.

We have seen it to be probable that Ⓢ led over from an account of Jesus' teaching to some more or less extensive outline of his healing activity. This suggests that we may do well to consider the Lukan group whose agglutination of anecdotes we have already studied in the light of the corresponding groups in Mk. 1:40-3:6 and Mt. 8:1-9:34. For even the Matthean group answers more or less closely to Mk. 1:40-3:6. All three connections conform to the broad general rule of gospel structure: After description of the Beginning of the ministry an account of its Effects.

Mk. 1:40-2:22 is a group of anecdotes illustrative of Jesus' works, his following, and his mode of life. Like the Matthean Series it begins with the Healing of the Leper (1:40-45), but leads over through that of the Paralytic (2:1-12, used to prove Jesus' right to Forgive Sins) to a small group (2:13-22) whose motive is Defense of Jesus from the charge of association with publicans and sinners and of neglecting the fasts. In Ⓠ (Mt. 11:1-19 = Lk. 7:18-35) the motive of the great discourse on John the Baptist is to answer the question "Art thou he that should come?" It is answered in a sense corresponding to the Isaian doctrine of the rejected Servant. Mk's use of the material, however, is for a slightly different purpose. The Healing of the Leper (Mk. 1:40-45), which stands quite outside the meagre framework of chronological sequence as one of a multitude of similar occurrences, is introduced merely to illustrate how the importunities of the sick compelled Jesus to withdraw (*cf.* verses 38 and 45). The rest of the connection, however (2:1-22), is introduced for the sake of its bearing on the Growth of Opposition. Annexed are two further anecdotes of Sabbatarian controversy which lead up to plots against Jesus' life, (3:6). Obviously Mk. connects Sabbath-keeping with fasting, as in *Oxyrh. Log.* II, and uses the two Sabbath stories in succession to set in clearer light his own radical conception of Jesus' attitude of opposition to the scribes and the Mosaic law. Very significantly the Sabbath controversies are introduced by Mt. in 12:1-14 as part of a *separate division* (mainly Ⓠ) on this subject.

Now it has been shown in *Beginnings of Gospel Story*[22] that the series of anecdotes in Mk. 1:40-2:20 (Leper Healed, Procla-

[22] P. 23.

mation of Forgiveness, Eating with Publicans and Sinners, Fasting of John's Disciples, Jesus' Disciples Sons of the Bridechamber, Rights of New against Old) "appears to be suggested by the section of Q on the Stumbling of Israel," a portion of which was already employed by Mk. in 1:1-13. It would seem, then, that just as traces of an older motive remain in Mt.'s series of Ten Mighty Works (Mt. 8:1-9:34) and Stumbling of Israel (11:2-12:45), this older motive relating to the Effect of the Ministry, so in Mk. also the section whose editorial motive is the Growth of Opposition, shows intrinsic traces of an older motive, kindred but not identical in character. In Mk. we are told how opposition is aroused by Jesus' claims of superhuman authority, how it culminated in plots by "Pharisees and Herodians" against his life (3:6). Jesus has presumed to forgive sins, disregard distinctions of caste, set aside observance of fasts and Sabbaths "because he is the Son of man." This is the characteristic point of view of R Mk., illustrated again in the charge which brings about the death of Jesus in 14:61-64, but it is certainly, both in its occurrence here and in chapter 14, an unhistorical conception.[23] True, the embodied material also aims to show how the Jews were "stumbled in him," but in Q the motive is somewhat different, and the apologetic does not rest on bald appeal to miracle. It depicts Jesus at work in the character of the Isaian Servant. Jesus is set forth in his mode of life, his compassionate service to the "little ones," his associates, as fulfilling the Isaian ideal. He comes with healing proclaiming "glad tidings to the poor." He meets opposition, but of altogether different character from that described by Mk. Q does not make even the scribes find fault with Jesus for presumption in encroaching on the prerogative of God. That is Markan (cf. Mk. 14:60-64). The Servant of God in Q is too meek and unassuming. To the self-righteous he is a mere man of the people, a glutton and wine-bibber mingling with publicans and harlots.

This Q conception of Jesus as "made a minister of the circumcision for the sake of the promise given to the fathers,"

[23] Mk. 2:27, where a more constructive, less dogmatic attitude, is taken toward the Sabbath, with use of the more liberal rabbinic interpretation (see *Beginnings, ad loc.*), is found neither in D nor in either Synoptic parallel.

"born of a woman, born under the law" and as meekly "enduring the reproach" of Israel, is certainly more authentic (Paul himself being witness), than the Markan, which represents him as overriding the law by superior authority as "Son of man" supported by miraculous power.

Taking Mk. 2:1-3:6 as a whole, and comparing 12:13 and 14:60-64 it is obvious that $\mathfrak{R}^{Mk.}$ thinks of the charge against Jesus, his trial, condemnation, and death, in the same terms as would be used in the case of the condemnation and death of Stephen and James the Just at the hands of the same persecutors. Stephen is stoned because he had said "Behold I see the heavens opened and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." James was stoned (as Hegesippus relates) in consequence of acknowledging Jesus publicly as "the Son of man" who would come again in judgment.[24] So in Mk. 2:1-3:6 and 14:60-64 Jesus himself excites the same murderous Jewish opposition by the same presumptuous claims. Here he professes authority as "Son of man" to forgive sins (2:10) and to disregard the Sabbath (2:28).[25] But this is not only historically anachronistic; it is an *alteration of the meaning of the source.* In *Beginnings of Gospel Story* (*ad loc.*) it was made clear, (independently of Loisy), that the interjected controversy with the scribes over Jesus' claim of the right to forgive sins (2:6-10) is a later editorial supplement, not originally connected with the Healing of the Palsied Man. Still more significant for our purpose is the sequel in ver. 13-17, where Jesus raises opposition by "eating and drinking with publicans and sinners," and still further in ver. 18-22, where he declines to fast with the Pharisees and the disciples of John. These $\mathfrak{Q}$ data are used by $\mathfrak{R}^{Mk.}$ in illustration of his theme, the Growth of Opposition. But their appositeness is more apparent than real, since they

[24] *Ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* II, xxiii, 3-19. The "scribes and Pharisees" set James on "the pinnacle of the temple" and demand "What is the door of Jesus?," to which James replies: "Why ask ye me concerning Jesus the Son of man? He himself sitteth in heaven at the right hand of the great Power and is about to come on the clouds of heaven." Cf. Mk. 14:62 and Acts 7:56.

[25] The combination is probably Markan. In Mt. 12:1-15 a new setting is found (as above noted) for the Sabbatic controversies; and the fourth Gospel (Jn. 5:1-47) only connects the right to forgive sins by implication in the defense of the judicial authority of "the Son of man" (5:22-30).

have intrinsically nothing to do with the charge of blasphemy in claiming to be the Son of man which issues in the conspiracy of 3:6. On the contrary the title "Son of man" and the authority alike are enigmatic in Mk. 𝔖, we know, employed the title (Mt. 11:19 = Lk. 7:34), though no fragment survives to explain why, or in what sense. But we need only turn to the 𝔔 context to see the true connection of the anecdotes. In 𝔔 (Mt. 11 = Lk. 7) they illustrate the 'stumbling' of the Baptist (and Israel) "in" Jesus. And this stumbling of Israel is because he is not the ἐρχόμενος they look for, but *corresponds to the suffering Servant of Isaiah,* proclaiming glad tidings to the poor, healing the sick and saving the lost. Neither to the Baptist nor to the wicked and adulterous generation[26] is this an acceptable "Son of man."

It is quite apparent, then, that Mk. in 2:1-3:6 displays his own adaptation of older sequences precisely as do Mt. and Lk., though with a much less tolerant spirit toward Jewish beliefs and institutions. Mk.'s material reflects two *motifs,* one that of the Rejected Servant (2:1-22) earlier than the present Markan context, the other that of Opposition to Jesus' Pretentions as Son of Man, which may be simply that of 𝔎 Mk. himself. The former *motif* is identical with that of 𝔔 in Lk. 7:18-35 = Mt. 11:2-19, and has the following sequence:

1. Healing the Leper, Mk. 1:40-45.
2. Proclaiming Forgiveness, 2:1-12.
3. A Friend of Publicans, 2:13-17.
4. Disciples of John fast, 2:18-23.

Item 1 of Mark's series (Leper Healed) sits loosely to the context, but the remainder is closely linked. Item 3 (Call of Levi; *cf.* Lk. 7:36-50 and 19:1-10) seems to blend this *leit-motif* of 𝔔 with that of the Mission of the Twelve. The banquet scene in which Jesus associates with "publicans and sinners" is quite subordinate in Mk. to the interest of the growth of Jesus' following, though it is noticeable that no attempt is made as yet

[26] The fourth evangelist as usual takes ground above either Mk. or 𝔔. Jesus is "the Son of man" and has judicial authority (Jn. 5:27) but his judgment is that of the light which comes into the world (τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν, 3:19-21), and the title ὁ ἐρχόμενος is explicitly applied to him in *this* sense in the Prologue (1:9); cf. 6:14; 11:27 and Heb. 10:37.

to identify Levi with any member of the Twelve. This occurs only later, in Mt. 9:9. In the Markan source the incident can have had no other application than Lk. 7:36-50 (Penitent Harlot) and 19:1-10 (Zacchaeus). Indeed were it not for the name and location the story of Zacchaeus might be only a variant of Mk. 2:13-17.

From the traces of precanonical groupings in Mt. and Mk. we return to the Shorter Interpolation of Lk., asking the question whether similar traces of precanonical τάξις and similar editorial adjustment to the canonical τάξις can be found.

It is noticeable that in Lk. 7:1-8:3 no direct trace appears of the Healing of the Leper, though we should expect to find an instance of the kind before the reference in 7:22 "the lepers are cleansed." At least, when Lk. inserts from an unknown source in 7:11-17 (Widow's Son) an instance to meet the reference "the dead are raised up" we have a right to expect that the incident of the Healed Leper if once a part of the context would not lightly have been removed; for even the inserted editorial summary in ver. 21 ("in that hour he cured many" etc.) makes no specific mention of the cleansing of lepers. Manifestly the difference is that in 5:12-16 Lk. had already related the Leper incident in Markan form and connection; whereas his Markan example of raising the dead came later (Lk. 8:40-48). The taking up of Mk. 1:40-45 in Lk. 5:12-16 would of course necessitate the cancellation of its 𝔖 equivalent in Lk. 7.[27]

If we may assume with some critics that the incident of the Samaritan Leper (Lk. 17:11-19) is a variant form of the same anecdote, there will be a certain analogy of editorial procedure between it and the Raising of the Widow's Son (Lk. 7:11-18). In both cases we have a miracle heightened by the typical Lukan *pathos* (Samaritans, widows etc.). In the case of the former ("Lepers are cleansed") the heightened variant is deferred. In the case of the latter ("the dead are raised up") Lk. introduces the variant (Widow's Son at Naïn) immediately before the reference, because the equivalent Markan incident (Jairus' Daughter, Mk. 5:22-43 = Lk. 8:41-56) is deferred. Whether

[27] On the evidence for acquaintance by Mt. and Lk. with this 𝔖 form see *Beginnings of Gospel Story* p. 20, note on ver. 40, 41.

in either case the Lukan variant is derived from 𝔖 can be decided only by scrutiny of its style and intrinsic motive. Certainly there is a close relation of motive between the anecdote of the Believing Gentile and that of the Grateful Samaritan. In each case the point is directed against the obduracy of Israel. "This stranger" puts to shame the home-born. We could, of course, attribute this special adaptation in the Samaritan Leper to Lk.'s own editorial revision, which would leave little to distinguish the basic story from Mk. 1:40-45. But in the case of the Believing Centurion (𝔔) this adaptation is antecedent to 𝔎$^{Lk.}$, since it is equally apparent in the Matthean version. So long as the Believing Centurion remains an example of Jesus' acceptance by the lowly, the Penitent Harlot and Grateful Samaritan will tend to a place alongside. And this application is indisputably 𝔔's.

The cancellation of the Leper incident by 𝔎$^{Lk.}$ offers, then, no obstacle to its location in 𝔖 at the point where it occurs both in Mt. and Mk., at the head of the series of Mighty Works. This agrees, as we have seen, with the implication of the 𝔔 reference Lk. 7:22 = Mt. 11:5. As regards the incident of Eating with Publicans and Sinners, Lk. has two variants, one concerning eating with *publicans* (19:1-10), the other the Penitent Harlot (7:36-50). Only the latter appears here. The closer parallel with Mk. 2:13-17 is deferred. But surely the derivation of both these 𝔓$^{Lk.}$ anecdotes from the same source (𝔖) as the 𝔔 section on the Stumbling of Israel is made probable not only by their intrinsic affinity with it, but by the fact that even in Mk. traces of the banquet scene remain. Lk., however, is no more faithful to the τάξις of 𝔖 than Mk. or Mt.; for we have seen that we cannot build upon the order:

1. Centurion's Faith, 7:1-10.
2. Raising the Dead, 7:11-17.
3. Disciples of John, 7:18-35.
4. Sinful Woman Forgiven, 7:36-50.
5. Ministering Women, 8:1-3.

It is indeed taken to be significant that Mt. and Lk. agree (?) in placing item 1 next (or next but one) to the Sermon. The real insignificance of this *approximation* to agreement

appears clearly from our analysis of redactional motive.[28] Item 1 neither tolerates location as first of a series, nor shows any close instrinsic relation to the *leit-motif* of item 3 (Stumbling at the Servant).

We cannot, therefore, be convinced by Spitta that its place in Lk. 7:1-8:3 *as well as* that of item 2 (Widow's Son) is fully accounted for by the need (in the mind of $\mathfrak{R}^{Lk.}$) to supply instances of "raising the dead" (Spitta refers to 7:2). The able critic asks us to believe that "all these things" which came to the ears of John (7:18) were not "the works of the Christ" (so Mt. 11:2), but an account of Jesus' *preaching* only. His argument is that if the Baptist *already* had miracle as a basis for his faith it was no help to supply him with more miracle. Our answer must be: What the Baptist had to go upon was not miracle, but only *report* of miracle. His messengers bring him *authentication* of the report. Jesus' fame *as a teacher* was a laggard (if we may be guided by gospel tradition), as compared with his fame *as a healer*. The latter has reached the Baptist. It requires now to be both confirmed and corrected. And not for the Baptist alone and his disciples, but for all who are "stumbled in 'the Son of man.'" For $\mathfrak{Q}$ the title ὁ ἐρχόμενος is to be understood in the sense of Is. 35:4-6, Hab. 2:3 LXX (cf. Heb. 10:37 f.). The Baptist and his "disciples" employ it in a different sense—doubtless the sense of Mal. 3:1-3; 4:1-3 (*cf.* Mt. 3:12 = Lk. 3:17). The question of the disciples of John becomes therefore in $\mathfrak{Q}$ the occasion for an address of Jesus to the multitudes on the *real* sense in which he is ὁ ἐρχόμενος, the "Son of man," and the relation of his vocation and message to John's. The discourse naturally begins with the answer sent to John "Blessed is he whosoever *shall not be stumbled* in me."[29] We are not at liberty to ask whether this answer is really in accordance with facts, or even (as Spitta does) whether a still earlier form of $\mathfrak{S}$ may not have lacked these suggestions of disappointment on the part of the Baptist. *The* $\mathfrak{Q}$ *material includes these traits.* $\mathfrak{S}$ *in the form in which it lay before Mt. and Lk.* represented an account of Jesus'

[28] For the redactional motive of the Matthean placing we must refer the reader to forthcoming articles on "The Editorial Arrangement of Matthew 8-10" in the *Expositor*.

[29] For the Johannine treatment in relation to Mk. and $\mathfrak{Q}$ see note 26.

activity as being brought to John, and the incident as leading Jesus to draw the contrast between his own ministry and that of his predecessor. He depicts his own in terms of the Isaian 'Servant' who "proclaims glad tidings of peace," healing the broken-hearted, cleansing the lepers, raising the dead (in trespasses and sins), and yet "despised and rejected of men." The Servant humbles himself in obedience unto death. In due time the narrator *must* have related also how he was also "highly exalted" (cf. Phil. 2:9 with Is. 52:13).

For the purpose implied in this important section of Q it is *not* sufficient to relate, parenthetically, that on the spot, and as if now for the first time, Jesus "cured many of diseases and plagues (*μαστίγων cf.* Mk. 5:29) and evil spirits, and on many that were blind he bestowed sight." The present miracles will be of no value unless they serve as further examples of those which *had previously characterized Jesus' ministry throughout.* This is in fact the meaning of the editorial supplement Lk. 7:21. The representation implies in any rational composition some previous exhibition to the reader of the scenes of Jesus' ministry. It implies some exposition of the nature of his work *both* as proclaimer of the "glad tidings to the poor" and *also* as the God-sent healer and savior of Is. 26:19; 29:18 f.; 35:5 f., and 61:1. The fact that the *cleansing of lepers* constitutes a unique addition to the Isaian catalogue of the works of the Servant, without any warrant from the Isaian text, is very strong evidence that some instance of this particular kind of healing had already been related. Since all three Synoptists agree in depicting Jesus first as preaching the glad tidings and thereafter engaging in a series of works of healing, while in two out of the three the Cleansing of the Leper stands at the beginning of the series, we may safely infer that but for its previous coming in via Mk. at Lk. 5:12-16, this incident would also have appeared in Lk. between 7:1 and 7:17.

It is apparent, therefore, that the two items of the Believing Centurion and the Widow's Son in Lk. 7:1-17 are mere remnants or substitutes for a much fuller description of the ministry, which included specifically some healing of a leper among other "mighty works," and some instances such as those of P Lk. 7:36-50 and 10:1-10. Such a description is presupposed in the ensuing contrast of the Servant-ideal with the expectation of

those who with the Baptist stand outside the kingdom and are "stumbled." The condensed agglutination of Lk. 7:1-8:3 has therefore small claim to represent the source, whether as respects order or contents. On the contrary it seems to be implied in the material itself that $\mathfrak{R}^{Lk.}$ has both cancelled and transposed with far greater freedom than in the case of Mk. his primary source. Even as respects the teaching material (A), where Mk.'s defect was most obvious, $\mathfrak{R}^{Lk.}$ has apparently effected the very serious cut of the Antitheses. In narrative (B), where we should expect him to prefer Mk, he is far more generous in supplementing than Mt. (as we should also decidedly expect); but he seems to have largely sacrificed in the process of this supplementation the τάξις of the source. To all appearance this $\mathfrak{S}$ τάξις was itself quite as pragmatic as Lk.'s own. But that of Lk. is complicated by the desire to write καθεξῆς, and to preserve as nearly as possible the authoritative τάξις of Mk.

To determine the probable order of $\mathfrak{S}$ after the Sermon one must set side by side that of all three Synoptists, especially that of Mk. 1:40-2:22 and Lk. 7:1-50, taking into account the motives already defined for Lk.'s alterations by transfer, cancellation and supplementation.

| Mk. 1:40-2:22. | Lk. 7:1-50. |
|---|---|
| 1. Leper healed. | 1. Anticipated, 5:12-16. |
| | [Centurion's Servant, 7:1-10]. |
| | [Widow's Son, 7:11-17]. |
| 2. Sinners Forgiven. | 2. Transposed, 7:36-50. |
| 3. Publicans. | 3. Distributed (7:34); 19:1-10. |
| 4. John's Disciples. | 4. John's Disciples, 7:18-35. |

It is far from surprising that Mk., though acquainted with the full $\mathfrak{Q}$ story of the Question of John's Disciples, together with its sequel, Jesus' Address to the Multitude regarding himself and John, should not care to include more in his story of the Growth of Opposition than the mere statement that John's disciples joined with the Pharisees in questioning Jesus as to the observances. It has been shown in *Beginnings of Gospel Story, ad loc.*, that the whole description of the Baptist as Elijah in Mk. 1:2-6 including the quotation of Mal. 3:1, wrongly cited as from "Isaiah," and coinciding exactly with the $\mathfrak{Q}$ form in its remarkable departures from the LXX, is dependent on this sequel. But the evangelist who in Mk. 1:7 f. represents John

as proclaiming Jesus to the multitude, as the Coming One, the "greater" than himself who will "baptize with the Holy Ghost" is not likely to have taken up as it stood in Q the story of John among those who "stumbled" sending messengers to ask: "Art thou He that should come?"

On the other hand that it is Lk., not Mk., who alters the original sequence in the group of anecdotes descriptive of the Effects of the Preaching is made still more probable by the close connection already adverted to[30] between the comparison of "this generation" to unreasonable children (Lk. 7:31-35) which closes the Q pericope of the Message of John, and the condemnation of "this generation" by the examples of the Ninevites and the Queen of the South (Mt. 12:38-45 = Lk. 11:29-32). As in Mk. 1:40-2:22 and in Mt. 11:2-19 the Message of John and its sequel formed the close. Lk. adds by transposition 7:36-50, and by supplement 8:1-3. But if this added material is permitted to come in between Lk. 7:31-35 and 11:29-32 the observed intrinsic connection already obscured by the insertion of 8:4-11:28 (principally from Mk.), is made quite unrecognizable.

We need only add that the evidences of editorial manipulation in 7:36-50 are very patent. For the sake of this touching incident Lk. has cancelled the Markan anecdote of the Anointing in Bethany (Mk. 14:3-9), though he need not have done so; for the resemblance is merely superficial, the two incidents (apart from a few transparently editorial additions) being quite independent, and different in fundamental character. The clauses "brought an alabaster cruse of ointment" (v. 37), "anointed them with the ointment" (v. 38), and the whole of verse 46 are additions so clumsy as almost to change the pathos of the sinner's penitence to bathos. Together with the name "Simon" in verses 40, 43, 44 (which if original should have appeared in verse 36), they are derived from the Markan anecdote of Anointing (*i. e.* as Christ) in Bethany by a woman disciple. More probably the additions from Mk. were made *before* the material came into the hands of Lk. Otherwise Lk. would scarcely have cancelled Mk. 14:3-9; for once we remove the almost grotesquely irrelevant trait of the anointing of Jesus' feet (!), almost the only point of resemblance that remains is that the Token of

[30] Above, p. 119.

Penitent Love and the Token of Exultant Faith are each the act of a woman. But at least the former has a close relation to the picture in the Q section on the Message of John of the Isaian Servant, in whom Israel is 'stumbled' because he "proclaims glad tidings to the poor." If he had the story, Mt. has not seen fit to preserve it, perhaps coinciding with Lk.'s judgment of it as a duplicate of Mk. 14:3-9. As a consequence the ordinary means of determining its connection with S is lacking. It was taken from *some* documentary source, otherwise we should not have the traces of redaction; but it is always possible to postulate another Lukan source showing the same affinity of tone and viewpoint with S which Lk. 7:36-50 displays with 7:18-35 = Mt. 11:2-19. If this alternative be preferred to the supposition that the anecdote is transferred hither by Lk. from some earlier position (relative to the references in vers. 22 and 34) the alternative must be admitted as possible.

Motives for the transfer hither of Lk. 7:29, 30 from the proper later connection of Mt. 21:31-32 have already been adequately set forth. The use by Mt. (!) here of the phrase "kingdom of *God*" in place of his stereotyped "kingdom of *heaven*" shows that this is source-material, though Sir John Hawkins places "Mt. xxi. $31^{b}$-32 = Lk. vii. 29, 30" in his third class (C) of Q material,[31] doubtless because of the wide divergence of expression. But this very divergence, made unavoidable as we have seen by the transposition, is highly characteristic of $R^{Lk.}$ We have still, however, one further observation of importance in respect to this Lukan transposition.

In Mt. 21:31-32 the saying follows appropriately upon the Parable of the Two Sons, which by many critics is regarded as the older and simpler form of the parable 'stylized' by Lk. (or some predecessor) into that of the Prodigal Son (Lk. 15:11-32). The two would thus stand to one another in the same literary relation as the following:

Mk. 1:1-8 vs. Lk. 3:3-17; Mk. 1:40-45 vs. Lk. 17:11-19; Mk. 2:5-10 vs. Lk. 7:36-50; Mk. 2:13-17 vs. Lk. 19:1-10; a list which might be instructively extended.

Both the parable of the Two Sons and the attached application to the repentance of the publicans and harlots, putting to shame the obduracy of the self-righteous, have admirable setting in

[31] *Oxford Studies*, p. 118.

Mt. 21:23-32, where Jesus is challenged for his authority by the scribes, and has replied by pointing to "the baptism of John." Now the parable as it appears in Lk. 15:11-32 has been elaborated and "stylized" with the typical Lukan pathos. It also has been transposed, as we shall have occasion to see in our study of the Longer Interpolation. An important link for the order of 𝔖 will be obtained by the restoration of the two. On the other hand the *logion* in Lk. 7:29 f. has been reduced to a mere *obiter dictum* of the evangelist. In fact the remark is not even logically attached. The reader has to make the best connection for it he can from the broken context of 24-28, 31-35. It still retains indeed its association with a reference of Jesus to "the Baptism of John," but on a totally different occasion. Its present function, as we have seen, is two-fold. It emphasizes 𝔎 Lk.'s contrast of the lowly who received the word and repented with the self-righteous; and it explains to the reader why in the following context (7:31-35) "this generation" is denounced as having already rejected "the Son of man." Employing the *logion* as he does for these purposes 𝔎 Lk. was compelled to practically rewrite it in words of his own to fit the context. The result is that he copies the phraseology of 𝔔 (ver. 35) concerning the redeeming Wisdom of God who is "justified" of her children, *i. e.* the "publicans and sinners." 𝔎 Lk. therefore writes that "All the people when they heard, and the publicans 'justified' God." We even detect a trace of the authentic 𝔔 context (*cf.* Mt. 21:25) in the phrase "being baptized with 'the baptism of John.'"[32]

Our general inference from these phenomena of Lk.'s Shorter Interpolation cannot be favorable as regards the originality of the order in the narrative section (B). It cannot even wholly confirm its placing as a whole. Doubtless B followed A in 𝔖; but at what interval? Whatever the motive (perhaps because Lk. understands from the coming of John's disciples that John was not yet cast into prison; *cf.* Jn. 3:22-30), the whole series of anecdotes illustrative of Jesus' ministry of "glad tidings"

[32] A further trace of 𝔖 may be found in the Markan parallel. The phrase "and the common people heard him gladly" (Mk. 12:36), seems to be Mk.'s equivalent for the Lukan adaptation of the *logion*. On the proper location in 𝔖 of parable and *logion* together see the forthcoming article on "The Longer Interpolation."

in contrast with the asceticism of John comes too early. In the Source a longer ministry is pre-supposed and a more advanced stage of popular sentiment toward the final decision. Whether for reasons of chronology or some other, Lk. has reduced in number the links of anecdote connecting the Coming of John's Disciples with the Beginning of Jesus' Ministry both by cancellation and by transposition. If he has added material from other sources he has not avoided interruptions of the 𝔔 context. Traces in Mt. and Mk. of older groupings indicate rather that what we have in Lk.'s Shorter Interpolation and some connected passages is largely if not wholly derived from 𝔖, though perhaps in some cases in expanded form; but that the original order has not been spared as was that of Mk., but sacrificed to several exigencies, among others 𝔎 Lk.'s inferences from the material of both his sources in the endeavor to narrate "in order." Unfortunately for this attempt Mk.'s order was by no means entitled to the authority accorded to it by the later Synoptists, while the order of 𝔖, by consent of all critics, must have been so largely topical and subjective as to afford little help to the primitive historian. Lk. might not have succeeded much better even had he been free from the misleading authority of Mk., and gifted with much greater critical insight than his attempts at a reconstructed order would indicate.

Lk. 8:1-21 forms, as we have seen, the last division of the section which began at 6:12 with the Choosing of the Twelve. Its opening paragraph (Ministering Women, 8:1-3) has obviously no relation of pragmatic purpose with the group of anecdotes in chapter 7, and might be characterized as 'connective tissue.' It is manifestly of editorial construction in ver. 1 f. (*cf.* 13:22, 4:43 and 13:11 for the phraseology), but embodies data certainly derived from an early source, probably the same employed by Mk. in 15:40 f. What was the original context of 8:1-3 it would be impossible to say. Lk.'s motive for inserting the data at this point is probably the need to account for the group of women implied in the Markan saying "My *mother* and brethren" etc., which occurs next in the Markan narrative (Mk. 3:31-35), though Lk., as we have seen, transposes. Like most of the anecdotes from 𝔖 in the Shorter Interpolation the fragment has lost all relation to its original order, but like the anecdotes of the Centurion's Servant and the Message of John, it

contains tantalizing implications of incidents of Jesus' ministry of healing quite unknown to the story of Mk. To Lk. it serves the purpose of a link leading back to the narrative of Mk. 4:1 ff., much as Lk. 18:9-14 leads back from the Longer Interpolation to the narrative of Mk. 10:13 ff.

Our general inferences from the material of Lk.'s Shorter Interpolation point to an original order quite different from that which the evangelist has constructed. $\mathfrak{R}^{Lk.}$ gives but a few fragments torn from a much fuller original. In the source they formed part of a survey of the ministry of Jesus as a whole. Reduced to the dimensions of a mere episode between the Sermon and the Markan section preliminary to the Mission of the Twelve, they lose their true significance, and indicate only how far Lk. has gone toward destroying the order of $\mathfrak{S}$, even while keeping most of its material separate from Mk. One thing, however, remains. The theme of the narrative section of the Shorter Interpolation as a whole is derived from $\mathfrak{S}$; for it coincides with traces found also in Mt. and Mk. Lk. found and used the theme of the Message of John. In $\mathfrak{S}$ the ministry of "the Son of man" had been contrasted with the expectation of John as a ministry of the Suffering Servant, not a ministry of the Angel of Judgment. The same contrast is traceable as the foundation of the $\mathfrak{Q}$ story of the Temptation (Mt. 4:1-11 = Lk. 4:1-13), which Mk. characteristically abbreviates (Mk. 1:12 f.) $\mathfrak{R}^{Lk.}$ has made the present $\mathfrak{Q}$ story of the Message of John the nucleus for a second group of anecdotes supplementing the (mainly) Markan group taken over in Lk. 4:31-6:19. Before it he has placed the two anecdotes of the Centurion's Servant and the Widow's Son, not so much for their intrinsic *motif,* as because they supplied gaps in the implied "works" of 7:22. After it he leads back to the order of Mk., his principal source, by a summarizing description of the Ministering Women (8:1-3), having meantime transposed the story of the Sinful Woman Forgiven (7:36-50), apparently for the purpose of accounting for this group of women. The series B is brought to a close corresponding to that of series A (6:46-49) by the Markan parable of Fruitful versus Unfruitful Sowing and connected *logia* on "hearing the word," followed by the anecdote of the Mother and Brethren which ends "My mother and brethren are these which hear the word of God and do it."